Additional file 1 - PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to *Systematic Reviews* from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

Section/topic		Checklist item	Information reported Line		
	#		Yes	No	number(s)
ADMINISTRATIVE IN	FORMA	TION			
Title					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review			3
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such			
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract			6
Authors					
Contact	За	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author			11
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review			21
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments		\boxtimes	
Support					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review			30
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor			344
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol			NA
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known			78
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)			168

METHODS					
		Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report			184
Eligibility criteria		8 characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria	for		
		eligibility for the review	be used as criteria for ontact with study authors, lanned 207 limits, such that it could be repeated ghout the review 215 dent reviewers) through 218 one independently, 226		
Information sources		9 Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study aut	_	199	trial
		registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage			
Search strategy 10 Pres	ent dra	aft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits,	such that it co	uld be repea	ated
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review			215
<u> </u>					
Selection process		11b State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) throughase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis)	-	218	each
Data collection 11		Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators		226	
Data items	.e), any	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources	, any		
Outcomes and		List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and			240
	13	prioritization additional outcomes, with rationale			262
Risk of bias in		Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether			202
this information will be use		this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how ndividual studies data synthesis			
DATA		, and the second			
	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized			NA
		If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods			NA
Synthesis	15b o	f handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., I^2 , Kendall's tau)			

3

15c Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, metaregression) NA

15d If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned

241

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line
			Yes	No	number(s)
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)			NA
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)			269